

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated February 6, 2007, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1 – 4 and 8 – 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065805 to Barnes (hereinafter “Barnes”).

In UDDI, a web service is described in a WSDL document that may be accessed by a requestor of the web service. The WSDL document points to the location of the web service, allowing the requested web service to be executed remotely from the requestor. Barnes clearly describes this in paragraph 78 (emphasis added):

As is well-known in the art, a Web services provides a standardized interface that permits software programs in the service provider to communicate with remote programs (e.g., in the device 101). More specifically, *a Web service is a software module hosted by a service provider that can be run remotely.* In order for it to be available to remote systems, *a descriptor of the Web service is published to a service registry. Information about the Web service and how to use it is found in the descriptor.*

as well as in paragraph 80 (emphasis added):

As discussed, the service registry of the preferred embodiment is a UDDI implementation and is essentially a catalog of businesses and the web-accessible services they provide. The Web Service Registry provides a mechanism to advertise and find Web Services. The Registry contains categorized information about businesses and the services that they offer and associates those services with *technical specifications of the Web*

service. As discussed, these technical specifications are defined using a descriptor, which in the preferred embodiment is a WSDL document.

In the discussion of claims 1 and 8 in the Office Action it is asserted that the downloading of a WSDL document associated with a web service anticipates the claimed downloading of a mobile application to a mobile device by invoking an associated mobile provisioning web service. However, this is incorrect, for as Barnes clearly describes, in UDDI the WSDL document that is downloaded is not the web service software, but is merely a description of the web service and a pointer thereto.

In order to clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art, claim 1 is amended herewith and now recites, *inter alia*:

“...deploying said mobile application as a web service accessible via a UDDI directory; and

invoking a mobile provisioning web service responsive to a request for said mobile application web service made using said UDDI directory, thereby causing said mobile application to be downloaded to said mobile device.”

In the claimed invention a mobile application is deployed as a UDDI web service. When the mobile application web service is requested by a requestor, instead of the mobile application web service being run remotely from the requestor as is done in prior art UDDI systems, the request causes a mobile provisioning web service to be invoked, whereupon the mobile application is caused to be downloaded to the requestor's mobile device.

Although both Barnes' web service and the claimed mobile application represent software to be executed, Barnes does neither teaches nor suggests downloading either the mobile application web service software itself or the mobile application software itself to a mobile device. Rather, Barnes relates to accessing a UDDI directory in order to invoke “a Web service...software module hosted by a service provider that can be run remotely.” Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is allowable, and requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 – 4 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 2 – 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 as amended claims the method steps of claim 1 as executable instructions tangibly embodied in a computer product readable by a machine, and is likewise deemed allowable in view of the discussion of claim 1 above. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 8, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 5 – 7 and 11 – 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0224674 to O’Farrell et al. Claims 5 – 7 are amended herewith to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Claims 1 – 13 are amended herewith to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 8, and are, *a fortiori*, deemed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claims 5 – 7 and 11 – 13 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that consideration of the above renders the present application in condition for allowance, which action Applicant respectfully solicits.

Favorable action on this response is courteously solicited.

Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Suzanne Erez/
Suzanne Erez
Reg. No. 46,688
Phone No. (972) 4-829-6069

Date: 14 May 2007
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598